

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 10 March 2021**



1. Opening and Welcome

The IACOM Chair, Mr David Gibbs, opened the meeting at 09h00 and welcomed everyone present via Microsoft Teams.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Siphiso Mavumengwana (SM)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Ms Sarah Winter (SW)
Mr Rashid Fataar (RF)
Mr Gaarib Williams (GW)
Mr David Gibbs (DG)
Prof Walter Peters (Co-opted BELCOM Member)

Staff

Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)
Mr Thando Zingane (TZ)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Anita Shologu (AS)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni(NT)
Ms Anita Shologu (AS)

Observers

None

Visitors

Ms. Cindy Postlethwayt
Mr. Willem Hutten
Ms. Bettina Woodward
Mr. Johan Malherbe
Mr. Graham Jacobs
Ms. Janine de Waal
Ms. Bridget O'Donoghue
Ms. Renske Haller
Ms. Katie Smuts

Mr. Tiaan Meyer
Mr. David McDonald
Ms. Emmylou Bailey
Mr. Henry Aikman
Ms. Claire Abrahamse
Mr. Andre Vercuil
Ms. Patricia Botha
Ms. Petra Broddle
Mr Mark Saint Pôl

3. Apologies

Mr Jason Knight (JK)

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 10 March 2021

The Committee resolved to approve the Agenda dated 10 March 2021 with minor amendments.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 10 February 2021

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 10 February 2021 and resolved to approve them with no amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- DG: item 13.7
- MS: item 13.5 and 25.1
- GW: item 15.2 and 24.1

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Appointments

8.1 None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM provided the committee with a report back on the outcomes of the following Appeals and Tribunal matters for noting:

- Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erf 86617, 16 Wherry Road, Muizenberg
- Proposed redevelopment of Erven 45530 and 45531, Nursery Road, Rosebank
- Proposed Alterations and Additions of Erf 649, 19 Torbay Road, Green Point
- Proposed Mixed-Use Development on Erf 8019, Sir Lowry Square, Woodstock
- Proposed Total Demolition of Erven 24514 and 24515, 10 Parow and Milner Streets, Maitland

9.2 Draft Heritage Protocol

The matter was held over to the next meeting.

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections undertaken:

- Proposed Rezoning, Construction of a Conference Venue, Restaurant, Spa and Associated Infrastructure, Glenhof, Erf 50339, 12 Glenhof Road, Claremont
- Proposed Boutique Hotel Development, Franschhoek Pass Winery, Farm No 1545 Paarl, Franschhoek

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

Nothing to report

10.3 Discussion of the Agenda

For noting.

10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections

- Proposed redevelopment of Erven 252 and 298, Raithby

10.5 HWC and DEA&DP Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)

Nothing to report.

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11. SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP (NID)

11.1 None

12. SECTION 38(1): INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13. SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

13.1 Proposed Nautica Development on Erf 1942, Beach Road, Mouille Point, Cape Town: MA HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ ERF 1942

Case No: 20032622SB0615E

The matter was withdrawn from the agenda.

SB

13.2 Proposed Redevelop the Historic Complex as an Agri-Tourism Facility on Farm 956, Donkerhoek, Simondium, Paarl: MA HM/ CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL/ FARM 956

Case No: 20030508SB1020E

Mr Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms. Bettina Woodward (Architect), Ms. Emmylou Bailey (Archaeologist), Mr. Henry Aikman (Heritage Consultant), Mr. Graham Jacobs (Heritage Consultant), Ms. Amy Feng (Landscape Architect) and Mr. Mark St Pôl (Landscape Architect) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The approach to the intervention in this heritage context (i.e. the philosophical point of departure) was discussed. In particular, the detailed nature of the reconstruction/ alteration of the cellar and stables buildings with the proposed reversion to gables and thatch, and how this in turn both influences and provides the narrative for the new structures, was noted as needing further resolution.
- In order for this approach/attitude to be wholly convincing, further detailed design development around this aspect, and in particular the overall detailing of the reconstructed elements on the historic barns in relation to the design resolution of the new barns, is necessary.

- Notwithstanding these concerns, a persuasive argument was presented for the overall layout including the re-thatching and reconstruction of gables to the cellar and stable buildings, as well as the placement of the proposed new buildings.
- The Committee commended the team on the thoroughness of the supplementary reports.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee endorsed the HIA phase 2 dated February 2021 prepared by Aikman Associates as having met the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA and resolved that the development may proceed subject to the following conditions:

1. Detailed drawings of the new buildings and associated landscape interventions to be submitted to HWC (IACOM) for scrutiny and endorsement.
2. Details of the proposed interventions to the existing cellar and stable building and interface to be submitted to Heritage Western Cape for scrutiny and endorsement.
3. All previous conditions still apply:
 - a. Archaeological monitoring of all earthworks around the historic werf;
 - b. The fabric analysis of the buildings to inform the development plan;
 - c. That archaeological advice and input be provided during the development process.
 - d. The Committee supports a Grade II grading for the historic werf and a Grade IIIA grading for the Agterbos complex.
 - e. The Committee supports the development of a CMP for the property.
 - f. The final SDP to be submitted to the APM Committee for comment.

SB

13.3 Proposed Rezoning, Construction of a Conference Venue, Restaurant, Spa and Associated Infrastructure, Glenhof, Erf 50339, 12 Glenhof Road, Claremont HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CLAREMONT / ERF 50339

Case No: 9022808HB0524E

SW gave reported back on the site inspection undertaken on 25 February 2021. See annexure SI 1.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms. Claire Abrahamse (Heritage Consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The site is large and resilient with the capacity to accommodate new development.
- One area of concern is the unresolved link between the existing building and the new development.
- The intactness of the existing interiors is noted. Careful detailing of the proposed link and its relationship to both the façade and the interior volume which is also being altered and opened up is required. The committee noted that an existing door could be a logical position for the link, taking cues from existing architectural apertures in the parapeted facade.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee requires the link element to be redesigned and resubmitted to HWC (IACOM). The redesigned proposal of the link element should consider the placement, interface, alignment (whether indirect or direct) and materiality of the intervention with respect to the existing fabric. A light-weight gasket element could be considered, and the interface between the linking element and the existing interior spaces of the building need to be properly and holistically resolved.

SB

**13.4 Proposed Development on Farm 1500, Paarl: MA
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/FARM1500**

Case No: 18102913AS1207E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms. Cindy Postlethwayt (Heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Visual impact and mitigation.

Final COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the HIA dated February 2021 as compiled by Ms Cindy Postlethwayt as having met the requirements of S38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

The Committee supports the findings and recommendations of the HIA and supports the proposed rezoning, sub-division and Spatial Development Plan (SDP) for the property, along with the *Design Guidelines: Urban, Architectural and Landscape* dated 01/11/2019 as included in the HIA, subject to the mitigation measures provided in the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) and attached as Annexure A being implemented

KB

**13.5 Erf 17958 & 17959, Site Development Areas 5 and & 7 (Quinan House), Somerset West: NM
HM/SOMERSERT WEST/PAARDEVLEI/ERF 17958 AND 1759**

Case No: 20062603ND0630E

MS (as architect for the proposal) recused himself and logged off from MS Teams.

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Nokubonga Dlamini introduced the case.

Ms Claire Abrahamse (Heritage consultant) and Ms Janine de Waal (Architect) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The committee noted that the one objection that had been received has been withdrawn following resolution stemming from a workshop session.
- The HIA is comprehensive with a set of carefully considered recommendations which must inform the detailed design development process involving further heritage input.
- The need for further and more detailed plans to be submitted to IACOM for further approval.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee endorsed the HIA prepared by Claire Abrahamse dated February 2021 as meeting the requirements of S38(4) of the NHRA and subject to the following conclusions and recommendations of the HIA.

The development is congruent with the heritage-based design indicators, which are rooted in the previous HIA (2005) and further overlaid with a more detailed series of parameters that related to the present-day functioning of the site.

The establishment of an active and positive interface between the Historic Precinct and the vlei is positive and will serve to enhance the significance of the site, particularly in terms of social and environmental significance.

The level of information provided for the design proposal remains of a high level, SDP-type degree of resolution, and therefore heritage impact can only be assessed to a degree, which necessitates the need for further design development and heritage input and assessment.

The development may proceed subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development is to be in accordance with the endorsed heritage indicators and guidelines arising from the HIA.
- (2) The high-level landscape framework and SDP plans for the proposed development are approved.
- (3) Given the high level of heritage significance of the site including its architectural and design qualities, architects with experience working on heritage structures and environments of high heritage significance must be appointed to undertake design development of the various built structures, and the material choice and detailing must be carefully considered and adequately illustrated in the building plan submission drawings.
- (4) More detailed plans, showing a higher degree of architectural resolution, informed by and development further with the heritage context and involving heritage input, must be submitted to HWC (IACOM) for approval prior to submission to Building Development Management.
- (5) The development may be phased. However, the primary landscaping intervention must be realised in the first phase of construction on the site. A landscape plan for the site informed by and developed with the heritage context must be submitted to HWC (IACOM) for approval with building plans for the first phase of development of the site.
- (6) Any and all alterations to Quinan House, a Provincial Heritage Site, must be submitted to HWC (IACOM) for approval.
- (7) The character of the Historic Precinct has been somewhat eroded over time by the slow accrual of a variety of insensitive additions and elements, such as shade-cloth structures over parking areas, solar panels on prominent roofs, and air conditioning condensers below

windows. The position of these elements must be restricted in the proposed new development, to the areas outlined in Figure 48. No shade-cloth carparking structures are permitted; parking pergolas are to be used instead. No roof windows are permitted within the roof volumes of double storey structures within the historic precinct, particularly where the roofs edge a public area.

- (8) The open space between Quinan House and the vlei should be respected and enhanced. Only physical barriers measuring a maximum height of 1200mm are permitted within the open area between Quinan House and the vlei, and no physical barriers (other than benches, planters, landscaping and the permeable fence along the edge of the vlei) of any height are permitted at a perpendicular angle within the area.

ND

**13.6 Proposed New Residential Development Erven 103,104 & A portion of Rotterdam Street, Wittedrift: MA
HM/BITOU/WITTEDRIFT/ERVEN 103 & 104**

Case No: 19090401AS0927E

The updated Hydatid 18/02/2021 prepared by Andre Vercuil was tabled.

Mr Thando Zingange introduced the case.

Mr. Andre Vercuil (architect) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following elements relating to the heritage context were discussed:

- The need for a positive response to settlement pattern and sense of place based on a combination of figure ground relationships, street pattern and the relationship of buildings to the street and public realm.
- The suggested grading of structures as Grade III needs to consider subcategories (IIIA, IIIB and IIIC).
- Although the previous further requirements have been addressed to an extent, the response still relies heavily on architectural criteria and does not adequately address placemaking criteria taking into consideration distinctive rural settlement patterns and street scale interfaces.
- The Committee suggested that the heritage consultant consult peers with experience in cultural landscape and rural settlement analysis and interpretation to assist with addressing the requirements of the previous meeting as follow:
 1. Analysis of the cultural landscape, including the built form.
 2. Assessment of the significance of the heritage resources identified, including the grading of individual buildings and the cultural landscape as a whole.
 3. Development of a set of heritage indicators which will inform the design response (and against which the design response may be assessed).

INTERIM COMMENT:

With reference to the further requirements and minutes of the previous IACom meeting, the committee was not satisfied that the requirements had been adequately addressed. Further

analysis and interpretation of the settlement pattern with respect to scale, grain, and place-making is required to inform, influence and direct the reworked layout of the proposal to achieve an appropriate fit.

TZ

**13.7 Proposed New Residential Development Erf 177887, Ottery: NM
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/OTTERY/ERF 177887**

Case No: 15101207

DG recused himself and logged off from MS Teams. The Committee elected MS to chair this item.

Updated Phase 1 HIA dated 16/02/2021 prepared by Bridget O'Donoghue was tabled.

Mr Thando Zingange introduced the case.

Ms. Bridget O'Donoghue (Heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Under-grading of individual buildings.
- Significance related to social history.
- Landscape features and patterns.
- Precinct scale significance.
- The tree-lined wide streets and open spaces contribute to the character of the site.
- The broad indicators presented.
- The consultant noted that one comment had very recently been received from the City of Cape Town (CoCT); IACom has not yet had sight of this comment.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee noted the further work done to the phase one HIA subsequent to the site inspection and initial tabling of the report in March 2020, including the social impact report. The committee again noted and confirmed the very high social, spatial and architectural significance of the site while at the same time recognizing the site's potential for careful infill, adaptive re-use and new development. The committee confirmed that the site cannot in any way be regarded as a greenfield site.

The Committee remains of the opinion that several of the buildings are under-graded individually. The IIIA and IIIB precinct scale gradings are however broadly concurred with, although the development opportunities related to these are too broad as to have any real meaning at this stage, especially with regard to the scale of the infill areas.

The Committee noted that a more developed and finer-grained heritage indicator study would assist decision-making going forward. The committee strongly recommends that this be done as a further refinement of the Phase One HIA to assist definition of the development proposal, rather than dealing with these broad issues later along with a Phase 2 assessment.

TZ

14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

14.1 None

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

**15.1 Proposed Boutique Hotel Development, Franschhoek Pass Winery, Farm No 1545 Paarl, Franschhoek: MA
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / FRANSCHHOEK / FARM1545**

Case No: 20012313AS0225E

The Committee report back on the site inspection undertaken on 25 February 2021. See attachment SI1.

Ms. Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group), Ms. Renske Haller (Managing Director Architect) and Ms. Bridget O'Donoghue (Heritage consultant) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The site inspection report was tabled and discussed.
- A concern around the potential impact upon the cultural landscape of the proposed Olive Villas and Vineyard Villas with respect to their number, orientation, geometry, aggregation, and regimented regularity.
- The committee did not have any concerns about the proposed “manor house” (incorrect term) and spa.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee requires further exploration of the placement, orientation, aggregation, geometry, clustering and number of the Olive and Vineyard units as mitigation of the anticipated visual impact.

SB

**15.2 Proposed Redevelopment of Erven Re 33683, Re 5100 & Re 5101, Gordon's Bay: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ GORDON'S BAY / ERVEN 33683, 5100, 5101**

Case No: 19021102SB0213E

GW recused himself and logged off from MS Teams.

HIA and associated documentation prepared by Cindy Postlethwayt were tabled.

Mr Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms. Cindy Postlethwayt (Heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The committee commended the urban design component of the application and fully supports the findings and recommendations of the HIA dated January 2021 prepared by Cindy Postlethwayt.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee supports and endorses the HIA by Cindy Postlethwayt January 2021, including the recommendations on page 34. and the follows condition:

1. Development of the historic core is substantially in accordance with the Site Development Plan for the property, as indicated in Annexure C of this report.
2. All future alterations to the kraal and homestead on Re Erf 5100 must be submitted to HWC for approval. The proposed covered walkway in front of the homestead should be considered as part of the submission in respect of the homestead.
3. All future restoration, or other work, to these structures must be undertaken by a recognised heritage architect with the necessary expertise.
4. A recognised heritage architect with the necessary expertise must be appointed prior to any construction in the vicinity of the kraal and homestead, to advise on protection of the structures during such construction period.
5. Provide a minimum 5-meter curtilage to the kraal and homestead. Any development immediately adjacent to the homestead should be limited to an approximate 2 storey height (appropriate height determined by the eaves and ridge of the homestead). Any development immediately adjacent to and north of the kraal should be limited an approximate 3 storey height.

SB

**15.3 Proposed amendment for the Rheboksfontein Wind Energy Facility, Malmesbury Magisterial District, Western Cape: NM
HM/WEST COAST/ SWARTLAND / MALMESBURY / RHEBOKSFONTEIN WIND ENERGY FACILITY**

Case No: 15031602GT0317E

Original HIA and updated Heritage Specialist Impact Statement prepared by ACO Associates with respect to the amended proposal were tabled.

Mr Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms. Petra Broddle was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Amended layout reflects a reduced number of wind turbines (33 vs 35 approved) and further reflects wind turbines of increased hub height and rotor diameter.
- Query around public comment on the amended proposal
- No APM concerns.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the documents tabled and the letter dated 16 November 2020 prepared by ACO Associates and supported the amended proposal.

SB

**15.4 Proposed redevelopment of Erven 252 and 298, Raithby: NM
HM/RAITHBAY/ERVEN 252 AND 298**

Mr Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms. Cindy Postlethwayt (Heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

FURTHER COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection (SW, RF, MS and DS).

SB

16 SECTION 38(8) NEMA FINAL COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

16.1 None

**17 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF
INTENT TO DEVELOP**

17.1 None

18 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN INTERIM COMMENT

18.1 None

19 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL COMMENT

19.1 None

20 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

20.1 None

21 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION INTERIM COMMENT

21.1 None

22 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION FINAL COMMENT

22.1 None

23. SECTION 27 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES

23.1 None

24. ADVICE

24.1 New Commonwealth War Graves Commission Memorial: MA

Case No: N/A

GW recused himself and logged off from MS Teams.

Pre-application for advice.

Prof Walter Peters representing BELCom was co-opted to the IACom for this item.

Mr Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Cindy Postlethwayt (Heritage consultant), Ms Tiaan Meyer (Consultant), Mr Willem Hutten (Consultant) and Mr David McDonald (CWGC) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee expressed broad support and endorsement of the process diagram outlining the way forward but noted one query with respect to public participation following the architectural competition - between the selection of the preferred tenderer and submission of the detailed proposal to HWC.
- Controversial nature of architectural competitions in general.
- The Committee commended the application and consultation team for the comprehensiveness, thoroughness and clarity of the documents submitted.
- The legal query with respect to public participation is to be resolved offline (between applicant and HWC legal advisor), and the outcome to be communicated to the committee members for noting.

ADVICE:

HWC and the CoCT should resolve the legal query with respect to the potential need for (focused) public participation between the selection of the preferred tenderer and the submission of the detailed design to HWC. Once this is resolved, and the outcome integrated into the process diagram, the updated process diagram should be endorsed as the agreed way forward.

SB

**24.2 Engagement Process for the Groot-Winterhoek Complex Draft Protected Area Management Plan (DPAMP)
HM/BERGRIVIER/ PORTERVILLE/ GROOT WINTERHOEK**

Case No: N/A

Protected Area Management Plan and other associated documents to be tabled.

Mr Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Deadline 23rd of March 2021.
- Involvement of heritage consultant would be beneficial.

COMMENTS

The Committee will compile the comments via email.

SB

**24.3 Proposed Redevelopment of the site on Erf 56421 1 Torquay Avenue, Claremont: NM
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CLAREMONT/ ERF 56421**

Case No: 20081705KB0718E

DG recused himself and joined the discussion as a consultant.

The Committee elected MS to chair this item.

Application documents to be tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Mr. David Gibbs was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The legal context of the Independent Heritage Statement provided.
- HWC confirmed that the previous Notification for the Intent to Develop (NID) submitted has been withdrawn.
- The legal advisor confirmed that this committee cannot change a decision previously made and that a new application would need to motivate for a changed context or circumstances.
- The content in the independent report was noted.

Further requirements:

The committee requires the NID (or a reframed NID) to be resubmitted in order for further comment to be made.

KB

25 SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENTS

25.1 None

26. OTHER

26.1 Status Quo Report for Conservation and Adaptive Reuse and Tenanting of the Goldies Warehouse, Erven 9333, 1451, 1452, 1453, 1454, 1455, 1466, 1467, 1468, 1469, 11 Mechau Street, Cape Town: NM

Case No: 14062006GT0626M

MS recused himself as a committee member and as a I&AP.

Report prepared by Rennie Scurr Adendorff Architects was tabled.

Mr Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms. Katie Smuts (Heritage consultant) and Mr. Mike Scurr were present and took part in the discussions.

ADVICE:

The Committee noted and endorsed the report as tabled and recommends that the detailed demolition drawings be submitted to HWC (HOMs for scrutiny and stamping).

SB

27 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as recorded above. RF moved to endorse and adopt the resolutions and decisions and GW seconded.

28. CLOSURE:

The meeting adjourned at 17:00

29. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

14 April 2021

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: _____

DATE: _____

SECRETARY: _____

DATE: _____

Annexure SI1

IACom Committee Site Inspection Report for:

Erf/Farm No.: **ERF 50339,**

Street Address: **GLENHOF, GLENHOF ROAD, CLAREMONT**

Registered Owner/Applicant: **Econ Holding Prop (Pty) Ltd**

Grading: **Grade IIIA**

Nature of Application: **Section 38(4)**

Date of Site Visit: **01.03.2021**

HWC Representatives: **Mike Scurr; Sarah Winter; Rashid Fataar; Dave Saunders;**

Reasons for Site Inspection: **IACOM resolution to assess the site in order to provide comment on the HIA specifically with respect to the impact of the proposed new development.**

Report submitted by **Sarah Winter on 10.03.2021**

Site Procedure & Findings:

The site inspection was conducted on Friday 26th February by three IACom members.

Area Inspected: Interior of the main buildings and its garden setting.

Items Noted:

- The interior of the historic building in terms of significant architectural features and detailing.
- The extraordinary mountain vistas to the west with the need to retain the shaft of space related to the west elevation of the building.
- The capacity of the site to accommodate new development as proposed.
- The linking element between the new building and the south elevation requiring better resolution in terms of the location and nature of the juncture.

Recommended Action:

Members to report the findings of the inspection at the next IACom Committee meeting to be held on the 10 March 2021.

Which Committee should this report be submitted to:

IACom at the meeting held on the 10 March 2021

Photographs by S. Winter:



Annexure SI2

IACom Committee Site Inspection Report for:

Erf/Farm No.: **Farm NO 1545 Paarl Division**

Street Address: **Off Franschhoek Pass**

Registered Owner/Applicant: **Jasper Bruinsma, Fivefold Investments 1 (Pty) Ltd**

Grading: **Grade II Landscape**

Nature of Application: **Section 38(8)**

Date of Site Visit: **01.03.2021**

HWC Representatives: **Mike Scurr; Sarah Winter; Rashid Fataar; Dave Saunders; Olwethu Dlova**

Reasons for Site Inspection: **IACOM resolution to assess the site and context in order to provide comment on the HIA specifically with respect to the scenic and visual issues.**

Report submitted by **Sarah Winter on 10.03.2021**

Site Procedure & Findings:

The site inspection was conducted on Monday 1st March 2021 by 3 IACom members.

Area Inspected: Views across the site and the valley from the existing homestead and the site for the location of the Olive Grove units.

Items Noted:

- The location of the proposed development relative to the Valley section and the Franschhoek Pass.
- The potential visual impact of the Olive Grove units with specific consideration to the number, scale and configuration of units.

Recommended Action:

Members to report the findings of the inspection at the next IACom Committee meeting to be held on the 10 March 2021.

Which Committee should this report be submitted to:

IACom at the meeting held on the 10 March 2021

Photographs:



View from the front terrace of the main house overlooking the Franschhoek Valley (Sarah Winter)